

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/831,390

Examiner

Eric Hug

Applicant(s)

JUVAKKA ET AL.

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on November 7, 2003.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 6-9.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 03 May 2001 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 - * Certified copies not received: _____.
5. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - (a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
6. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

7. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
8. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No. _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the proposed drawing correction filed _____, which has been approved by the Examiner.
 - (c) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No. _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the margin according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

9. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No. _____ |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No. _____ | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Art Unit: 1731

Response to Amendment

The following is in response to the amendment filed on November 7, 2003.

Claims 6-9 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art does not teach or suggest a double doctoring device having the claimed combination of features including at least a doctor slat upstream of a doctor blade, whereby the angle between their respective points of contact is in the range of 15 to 70 degrees, and whereby the contact angle of the doctor slat is smaller than the contact angle of the doctor blade. The combination of the slat and blade and their angles of disposition read over prior art double doctoring assemblies consisting of two doctor blades.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments filed on November 7, 2003 have overcome the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leighton (WO 98/27279) in view of Kivimaa (US 5,178,731) and further in view of Boucher (US 5,032,229). Accordingly, this rejection is withdrawn.

Upon reconsideration of the prior art of record and the declaration filed on June 18, 2003, and after a further search of the prior art, there is no express teaching or suggestion for using a double doctor blade assembly for removing water from the pores of a suction roll. A double doctor is designed to remove paper and fibers adhered to the surface of a papermaking roll (which may be a suction roll). Fibers (and perhaps some water) may be removed from the pores

Art Unit: 1731

of the roll caused by a foil effect, resulting from having a stationary doctor blade against a moving roll surface. However, the prior art, and in particular Leighton, teaches that this foil effect is undesirable and ineffective with a doctor blade, because debris removed from roll pores by a doctor blade adheres to the back side of the blade and is not completely removed from the roll surface. Using two doctors only increases this negative effect by providing more locations for debris to accumulate. To enhance the cleaning of the roll pores in a suction roll, the prior art additionally provides a source of pressurized fluid or suction disposed between the two blades.

The function of the doctor slat is different than that of a doctor blade. A slat is designed to remove water from the pores of the suction roll through a pronounced foil effect, rather than to scrape debris from the surface of the roll. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to substitute the leading blade of a double doctor with a doctor slat, as the two devices have different functions leading to different effects.


Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."


Art Unit: 1731

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Hug whose telephone number is 571 272-1192. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0651.


jeh


STEVEN P. GRIFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700